

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

a) Broadcast TV is still *\*crucial\** to me for information, yet there is less diversity there than in years gone by.

b) Counting every web site available in determining diversity is absurd. Most citizens are completely unaware of most web sites. And if they were aware of and able to access them, 99% of all web sites are completely unable to function with more than a few dozen simultaneous "viewers". Furthermore, many major ISPs forbid individual citizens from using their computers to host web sites (why isn't the FCC doing anything about that?). Furthermore, many major ISPs enforce non-symmetrical transmission speeds, so that lots of ads can be pumped to the citizen, but relatively little information (such as a web site) can flow the other way -- why isn't the FCC doing anything about that?

c) Despite offering a great many cable channels, there is still, after all these years, only exactly one (1) cable channel I can get that is devoted to the Black American perspective. Where is the promised diversity of viewpoint? With Blacks representing 10% of the population, wouldn't it be reasonable to hope that 10%, (instead of .1%) of cable channels would be representative of that population? The percentages of cable channels aimed at women are likewise out of whack with the American population. And how could it be any different when a few rich companies control virtually all the cable programming that most Americans watch?

d) The *\*effective\** number of video providers is decreasing, not increasing. Most people will only obtain video from major outlets, controlled by a few powerful companies. Video via Internet is a joke, largely because phone and cable companies charge more for decent bandwidth than consumers are willing to pay -- why isn't the FCC doing anything about that?

e) The continuing decrease in diversity seems likely to eventually succeed in stifling the Internet as a means of citizen expression. In the past, my phone company *\*had\** to give my independent ISP use of their lines in order to sell me service. Despite the fact that my phone company is not my ISP, I have to pay them nearly as much as if they were providing me ISP services, even though they are merely providing access to the pre-existing copper wires -- why has the FCC permitted this situation to arise? Now, my ISP can be kicked out by my phone company at any time -- why did the FCC allow this situation to arise? My ISP provides me with a great many services that my phone company does not, including the crucial ability to host a web site so that I can offer information and not just be a target for the ads of the handful of companies that already control most of the web page visits on the Internet.

f) As media control becomes less diverse, I have experienced only a decrease in diverse formats, programs, and content. News organizations have been gutted and made less independent (e.g., Disney-owned reporters cannot report on Disney misdeeds). The media is increasingly ineffectual as a watchdog for government misdeeds.